

Attractiveness of the organization for highly qualified employees: indicator and key organizational factors

Aleksandr Leonidovich Mazin^{1*}, *Aleksandr Petrovich Egorshin*², *Irina Vladimirovna Guskova*³, and *Anna Aleksandrovna Troitskaya*⁴

¹Nizhny Novgorod Institute of Management, Branch of the Russian Academy of National Economy and Public Administration, Department of Economics and Economic Security, Nizhny Novgorod, Russia

²Nizhny Novgorod Institute of Economics and Management, Administration, Nizhny Novgorod, Russia

³Lobachevsky State University, Department of University Management and Innovation in Education, Nizhny Novgorod, Russia

⁴National Research University Higher School of Economics, Department of Science and Innovation Management, Moscow, Russia

Abstract. The article is devoted to the analysis of organizational factors that affect the attractiveness of an employing organization for employees with a high level of professional qualification. Such employees must not only be attracted initially, but also be retained further, which requires their desire to cooperate with the employer for a long time. As an indicator of attractiveness, the authors consider the willingness (or unwillingness) of employees, who rated the level of their own professional skills by 4 or 5 points out of 5, to change their current job. Using econometric calculations based on polls conducted by the authors in 2011 and 2018 among employees of organizations in the Nizhny Novgorod region, authors have identified factors that have a statistically significant effect on the indicator of an organization's attractiveness, and have formulated conclusions and proposals on possible adjustments to the organization's personnel policy, depending on whether the organization has problems with some of these factors.

Keywords: qualified employees, employer attractiveness, organizational factors, labor potential, statistical significance

1 Introduction

In modern economics, the need for qualified personnel is constantly growing in all innovative industries. The ability to attract and retain such employees is becoming increasingly important to the competitiveness of companies in their field of activity. At the same time in the labor market, companies are competing for the best applicants. The result of this struggle depends on achieving their loyalty, which is expressed in belief in the goals

* Corresponding author: almazin1@yandex.ru

and objectives of the organization, agreement to exert efforts on its behalf, and a desire to belong to it [1]. Peculiarities and methods of attraction and retention of qualified personnel are devoted to the works of several authors. A.O. Dudnik and E.A. Sysoeva assign primary importance to the creation of a so-called "Golden personnel reserve", represented by the most promising and valuable employees for the organization, and the use of BigData tools [2], R. Al Aina and T. Atan assign primary importance to talent management strategy development [3], I. Bakanauskiene et al. assign primary importance to creation of a positive work environment with recognition and opportunities to improve skills [4], E.A. Kolesnichenko et al. assign primary importance to integrated motivation system [5]. Z. V. Yakimova and N.A. Tsareva develop a value-based approach [6], A.Y. Kibanov analyzes the reasons why qualified employees leave their employers [7]. Similar is the approach of M. Asmawi et al. [8] that look at the impact of employee empowerment and job satisfaction on organizational commitment. E.P. Khrapunova and A.E. Markov consider the role of top management to be of paramount importance for the retention of qualified personnel, which should provide unity of goals, ideas and directions of the organization's activity [9]. However, these and other works are mostly in the field of management, not economics.

The economic approach can be found in V.E. Gimpelson, R.I. Kapelyushnikov, and A.Y. Oshchepkov works. They examine the special seniority premium, which reflects the length of an employee's employment relationship with the same employer [10]. P. Darma and A. Supriyanto consider the impact of financial incentives on employee job satisfaction [11], C. Riordan and L. McFarlan Shore consider demographic factors [12], but do not analyze other things. R. Erdem and M. Demirkiram [13], T. Park and J. Shaw [14] analyze the negative economic consequences of qualified employees leaving the organization, but do not address the causes. This article belongs to the field of labor economics; it considers organizational factors as components of organizational labor potential. This allows us to analyze their impact on the attractiveness of the employer for employees in the same way as the labor potential of the employees themselves. The hypothesis of the research is the presence of quantifiable indicators of organizational factors in companies that affect the attractiveness of the employer for the most qualified personnel.

The purpose of the research is to identify organizational factors that statistically significantly affect the quantitative indicator of the attractiveness of the company for highly qualified employees.

2 Methods

As an information base in the article, we used the results of sociological surveys of employees of enterprises in Nizhny Novgorod and Nizhny Novgorod region, who studied by correspondence at universities of the city in economics and management programs (394 respondents in 2011 and 399 in 2018). A linear regression equation was used as an econometric model. An indicator of employer attractiveness according to the questionnaire conducted by the authors is the willingness/unwillingness of employees to change their jobs. The question was "Would you like to change jobs?" with "Yes" or "No" as options. The corresponding `job_change_want` variable takes values 1 and 0. To calculate the regression equation, questionnaires were selected from respondents who rated their professional skills at least 4 out of 5.

2.1 Explanatory variables

Indicators of organizational factors (labor potential of the enterprise):

1. Material interest of employees in innovative activity at the enterprise, variable `inn_motiv`.

2. Presence of any system of professional development at the enterprise. The variable training.

3. If the answer to the previous question is yes: at whose expense is the training carried out (value of the indicator: 0, if at their own expense; 1 – at the expense of both the employee and the employer; 2 – if paid entirely by the latter). Since the point of the indicator is to find out whether the employer has paid for advanced training, it was also assigned zero values for cases of no training at all. The variable is training_exp.

4. Has there been a conflict with the administration when an employee who had previously been trained at the employer’s expense has been dismissed? A positive answer to this question can be considered an indirect signal of the probable inability of management to competently manage the most qualified personnel. The variable is trained_left_confl.

5. The presence at the enterprise of a direct correlation between the income of employees and their level of education. The variable is wage_educ.

6. Existence of subjectivity of the manager in relation to the employees, variable is boss_tyranny. The questionnaire phrased this question as follows: “Can you think of an example of subjectivity (or complacency) on the part of your supervisor toward an employee?”

7. The presence, in the respondent’s opinion, of discrimination in employment relations at the enterprise. The variable is discr. It is important to note that it is not uncommon for employees who are not privy to the details of process and performance evaluation to mistake individuality of earnings for discrimination, which is the result of the difference in these results. This group of factors is described in more detail by A.A. Troitskaya (A.A. Mazina) in 2012 [15].

To improve the quality of the model as a whole and the accuracy of the coefficients, the characteristics of the labor potential of the respondents themselves were also included in the calculation. Their level of education, inter-company mobility potential, assessment of the quality of their own education and work skills, the choice of diploma or actual knowledge as a priority. In econometric calculations the following indicators of labor potential of an individual worker were used:

1. Level of education with the answer options “secondary”, “specialized secondary” and “higher”. The variable is educ, taking values from 1 to 3.2. An employee’s evaluation of the quality of his or her education with a score from 1 to 5. The variable is educ_quality.

3. An employee’s assessment of the quality of his or her work skills with a score from 1 to 5. The variable is skill_quality. The calculations in this study included observations with significance skill_quality 4 and 5.

4. An employee’s assessment of his or her inter-company mobility potential, with options ranging from 1 (none) to 5 (high). The variable is mobility.

5. The answer to the question of what is more important to the respondent: knowledge or a diploma (the third option – “equally”). The variable is knowledge_pref, taking values 3, 2, and 1, respectively.

For all “Yes/No” questions, a positive answer was assigned a value of 1, while a negative answer was assigned a value of 0.

3 Results

Table 1. Results of calculations and significance of indicators according to 2011 data

Dependent Variable: job change want	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t-statistics	Sig.
	B	Std. Error	Beta	Std. Error	Std. Error

Dependent Variable: job change want	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t-statistics	Sig.
	B	Std. Error	Beta	Std. Error	Std. Error
(Constant)	0.886	0.407		2.178	0.030
inn_motiv**	-0.134	0.064	-0.133	-2.079	0.039
training*	-0.175	0.103	-0.149	-1.707	0.089
training_exp	-0.036	0.051	-0,061	-.704	0.482
training_left_con	-0.115	0.094	-0,079	-1.227	0.221
wage_educ	-0.033	0.067	-0.031	-0.491	0.624
boss_tyranny*	0.128	0.068	0.128	1.901	0.059
discr**	0.150	0.069	0.147	2.178	0.030
educ	0.072	0.050	0.094	1.436	0.152
educ_quality	0.006	0.049	0.008	0.121	0.904
skill_quality	-0.069	0.089	-0.050	-0.767	0.444
mobility	-0.026	0.040	-0.043	-0.660	0.510
knowledge_pref	0.002	0.047	0.003	0.049	0.961

Table 2. Results of calculations and significance of indicators according to 2018 data

Dependent Variable: job change want	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t-statistics	Sig.
	B	Std. Error	Beta	Std. Error	Std. Error
(Constant)	0.589	0.388		1.516	0.131
inn_motiv	-0.023	0.064	-0.023	-0.358	0.721
training**	-0.242	0.114	-0.191	-2.121	0.035
training_exp	0.005	0.054	0.008	0.085	0.933
training_left_con**	0.231	0.115	0.130	2.005	0.046
wage_educ	-0.025	0.063	-0,025	-0.400	0.689
boss_tyranny**	0.149	0.069	0.143	2.151	0.033
discr**	0.162	0.081	0.138	2.005	0.046
educ	0.098	0.062	0.099	1.585	0.114
educ_quality	0.029	0.046	0.041	0.635	0.526
skill_quality*	-0.124	0.075	-0.113	-1.655	0.099
mobility	0.033	0.040	0.057	0.845	0.399
knowledge_pref	-0.024	0.039	-0.039	-0.614	0.540

* significance at the level of 0.1

** significance at the level of 0.05

4 Discussion

When analyzing the results of the calculations, it should be taken into account that the variable in the calculation reflects the desire to change jobs, and the attractiveness of the employer is characterized by the opposite quality – by unwillingness to leave it. Accordingly, the indicators, the coefficients of which in the equations have a negative value, have a positive impact on the attractiveness of the company for employees, and vice versa.

According to calculations according to the data of 2011, the enterprises that have a system of professional development and financially motivate employees to participate in innovative activities, are more attractive for qualified specialists. They are less likely to want to leave their employer. The presence of labor discrimination and arbitrariness on the part of management has a statistically significant negative impact on the interest of qualified employees in the company.

According to calculations based on 2018 data, of the variables that are significant in the model built on 2011 data, only one, the presence of material interest of personnel in innovative activity, ceased to be so. Another variable characterizing the organizational factor gained significance: the presence of conflicts in the dismissal of employees previously trained at the expense of the organization has a negative impact on the attractiveness of the organization for skilled workers.

5 Conclusion

The identified relationships can be used in human resource management at the enterprise to increase the interest of the most qualified employees in long-term cooperation with the employer. The rational policy of management in this area is to pay attention to the factors that have demonstrated in this study a significant impact on the studied indicator, identifying problematic and targeted work with them. If there is insufficient material interest of employees in innovative activity, it makes sense to change the system of motivation at the enterprise to increase it. If qualified employees assess the management style of the company as excessively authoritarian, in order to retain them, you will have to work to correct this style, at least in relation to the most valuable employees. If employees think there is labor discrimination at the company, they should find out whether this impression is not the result of an overly opaque performance evaluation policy, which should then be made more understandable. Conflict situations in the dismissal of employees previously trained at the expense of the organization may have two reasons. First, the leadership's inability to resolve such issues peacefully. Second, more systemic ones: the lack of elaboration and clarity of contracts and agreements concluded with such employees, or the complete absence of official documents on the issue. It is important to identify these causes and further address them. An underdeveloped professional development system will require steps in the appropriate direction to ensure that the most valuable and qualified employees have the opportunity to develop their knowledge and skills, which is an important condition for them to be motivated to work for the organization.

References

1. L.W. Porter et al., *J. Appl. Psych.* **5**, 603-609 (1978). <https://doi.org/10.1037/h0037335>
2. A.O. Dudnik, E.A. Sysoeva, *Internauka* **2-2(6)**, 42-44 (2017)
3. R. Al Aina, T. Atan, *Sustainability* **12**, 8372 (2020). <https://doi.org/10.3390/su12208372>
4. I. Bakanauskienė, R. Bendaravičienė, L. Barkauskė, *Probl. Persp. Manag.*, **15(2)**, 4-18 (2017). [https://doi.org/10.21511/ppm.15\(2\).2017.01](https://doi.org/10.21511/ppm.15(2).2017.01)
5. E.A. Kolesnichenko, Y.Y. Radyukova, V.Y. Lapshin, *Bul. Sci. Pract.*, **11(24)**, 268-275 (2017)
6. Z.V. Yakimova, N.A. Tsareva, *Azimuth Sci. Res.: Econ. Manag.*, **4(21)**, 294-298 (2017)

7. A.Y. Kibanov, *Upravlenie chelovecheskimi resursami: Strategiya, Marketing, Internatsionalizatsiya* [Human Resources Management: Strategy, Marketing, Internationalization] (Scientific-Publishing Center INFRA-M, Moscow, 2013)
8. Onsardi, M. Asmawi, T. Abdullah, *Int. J. Sci. Res. Manag.*, **5(2)**, 7590-7599 (2017).
<https://doi.org/10.18535/ijstrm/v5i12.03>
9. A.V. Kuligina, *Young Sci.*, **45(335)**, 324-327 (2020)
10. V.E. Gimpelson, R.I. Kapelyushnikov, A.Yu. Oshchepkov, *Econ. J. Higher Sch. Econ.*, **20(4)**, 553-587 (2016)
11. P.S. Darma, A.S. Supriyanto, *Manag. Econ. J.*, **1(1)**, 69-78 (2017).
<https://doi.org/10.18860/mec-j.v1i1.4524>
12. C.M. Riordan, L.M. Shore, *J. Appl. Psych.*, **82(3)**, 342-358 (1997).
<https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.82.3.342>
13. R. Erdem, M. Demirkiram, *J. Manag., Market. Logistics*, **3(1)**, 38-49 (2016).
<https://doi.org/10.17261/Pressacademia.2016116528>
14. T.Y. Park, J.D. Shaw, *J. Appl. Psych.*, **98(2)**, 268-309 (2013).
<https://doi.org/10.1037/a0030723>
15. A.A. Mazina, *Standard Liv. Rus. Reg.*, **8**, 91-97 (2012)